

FINISHED FILE

INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM SUPPORT ASSOCIATION
DC COORDINATION MEETING XXVII
WEDNESDAY, 23 MAY 2018
14:00 UTC

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-481-9835
www.captionfirst.com

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: This is Markus speaking. It's top of the hour. But we haven't got many people on the call yet. How many said they would attend, Eleonora?

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Hi, Markus. We had about 15 people on the list of registered participants.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: All right. Let's maybe wait a few more minutes, two or three minutes or so, and see whether they will join.

As we are waiting for others to join, you can see that we have a realtime transcription of our call. This is provided as an in-kind contribution by the IGF Support Association. We have received a contribution earmarked for enhancing the accessibility of the IGF, and discussing with the DCAD, it was felt that providing captioning would be a great way of using these funds to enhance the accessibility of the calls. And

also, I think it will benefit everyone, as it's much easier to follow a call when you have the transcript in front of you. And it also provides an excellent record after that. Two or three days after the call, usually the captioner sends us an edited version, and that provides a record. And of course, the IGF Secretariat will also record the call, and this is one of the questions I have to ask at the outset, whether there are any objections. But I presume there are none, that everybody is okay with having it also an audio record.

With that, I wonder whether we can start. I see a few more people have joined the call. We have an agenda. Eleonora has sent it out. My co-facilitator, Israel, is also on the call. And he and Eleonora will do most of the talking, and I see also last year's co-facilitator, Avri, is on the call. And this was great to have her input in the last agenda.

With that, Eleonora, can I hand it over to you for the first agenda item, an update of where we are with the MAG, overall preparation, and also give an update on the discussions on the possible venue? Please, Eleonora.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Thanks, Markus. Hi, everyone. It's Eleonora from the IGF Secretariat.

So I think many people are breathlessly waiting for a final announcement on the IGF 2018 venue. And what we can share now is that we have two countries as candidates, and our decision on a final venue depends on an acceptance of an offer from one of those two countries, as has been said on some MAG calls and as we have also made public in those MAG summary records. One country is in Europe; the other is in Asia. And the dates for one are in November, and the dates for the other are in December.

So the venues are tied to two specific sets of dates. In fact, I think we laid those dates out at some point. One would be from the 11th to the 15th of November, and the other from the 10th to 14th of December. And although this may be sort of cold comfort and not reassuring enough for those who are working on workshop proposals and need to communicate to people who are committing to their workshops, they can share that it will either be that week in November or that other week in December. So although certainly not ideal, in a sense, people can be told to expect one of those two weeks and to block one of those two weeks in their calendar in a provisional way.

So that's as much as we can share about the venue now until we make a final announcement, which of course, we, the Secretariat and MAG, hope will be soon. But I don't know if Israel has anything to add on that. Of course, there is a lot of discussion back and forth between the Secretariat and MAG on

this issue.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, please.

>> ISRAEL ROSAS: Yeah, hello. Hello, everyone, and thank you for joining us. As Eleonora said, the IGF Secretariat is pushing in a strong way to close one of the options. The MAG list has a special activity in these couple places. Taking into account that a press note has been sent to the MAG by one of the members regarding the facility to having the MAG meeting in Paris. However, this is not a formal announcement. It is my responsibility to let you know that we in the MAG are following closely the efforts carried out by the Secretariat. And at the moment, we only know that there are two potential venues with different levels of engagement, one in Asia, one in Europe. But we don't have a formal announcement. So we are expecting to have the announcement by the IGF Secretariat and by the MAG chair, and we are following closely those efforts.

So at the moment, the MAG, of course, is concerned about the dates and also is taking into account the timeframe and the time constraints in order to better shape the program this year.

So at the moment, in the MAG there are have been some discussions about that, but we are expecting the formal announcement, and we are up to the IGF Secretariat formal efforts.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thanks, Israel, yes, and Eleonora added the dates, the possible slots, 11 to 15 of November or 10 to 14 of December. And the November dates have caused quite a lot of concern amongst some MAG members because it coincides with last week of the Plenipot, when some of the decisions will be taken, and many potential IGF participants will have to be in Dubai at that time. So that is maybe a little bit unfortunate if that happens, but it is what it is.

I wonder whether there are questions, but I think both Eleonora and Israel have made it clear that that's about all they can say at this stage. We have to wait for a final announcement. But again, for those who are also on the MAG list, you saw there were some exchanges, and the MAG chair will say that the announcement should be around the corner. We don't have any response to Marianne's question. We don't know yet, but I think it should be pretty soon. There was an article in Le Figaro yesterday, which is a leading French newspaper, which quoted President Macron that France would host the meeting, so as you say in French (speaking French) there's no smoke without the fire. So there is an indication, but again, it is not official. And that is the venue in Europe Eleonora had mentioned that would be Paris from 11th to 15th of November.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Markus?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Please.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier Crepin-Leblond here. Thank you, Markus. Thank you for the update. Just a quick question on the workshop selection for workshop proposals. I know a lot of people are wondering whether they should submit a workshop or not depending on the location because they might or might not get funding to go to place A or place B. Will there be -- and I think I read somewhere that a deadline might be delayed until maybe a week after the official announcement. Is this confirmed?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Olivier. I think this is a good question, but as far as I understand, this, again, is something that is in the air. There's been a lot of support for the extension of the deadline for these reasons mentioned. But Eleonora, you are closer to the decision-making process in this matter. Can you fill in?

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: This is something that comes up in discussions between the Secretariat and the MAG. It is being considered an extension, but we have not officially granted one yet, but it is certainly a possibility. The obstacles faced in finalizing a proposal without knowing the details on the venue is something we are very sensitive too, so I feel safe in saying that it is more likely than not that we will give an extension. But I don't know if you have anything to add to that, Israel.

>> ISRAEL ROSAS: Yes, thank you. The MAG is also sensitive to that situation and has asked the Secretariat for an extension. I think there's a possibility, but it's -- I would not take it for granted, but I think that it's a good possibility to have an extension in order to adequate the timeframe to the current efforts on the IGF venue.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: I am sorry. I cut into someone. Is that you, Nigel?

>> NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, yes, but you go first, please.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: I just wanted to tack on to what Israel was saying, to be perfectly clear, that no one should proceed under the assumption that there is an extension and not submit their workshop proposal by the deadline because we have, as of now, not granted that extension. So just to be clear, and we want everyone to safely hand in and submit their proposals in time.

Go ahead, Nigel.

>> NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah, well, thank you very much. Good afternoon or good morning for others. I joined slightly late because I have been discussing GDPR, which is incredibly interesting.

So on this, I -- and we discussed this Friday evening at

the CSTD meeting. But in the last sort of 48 hours, I have been approaching people in the ICANN community. We are putting in some proposals, and the first question is whether it's December or November, of course. And so although I understand you can say it's either these dates or these dates, given the very uncertainty of where it is, sort of constrains people in giving a positive response. They say come back to us when you know definitely when it is, and I will consider being a panelist. So I think it does make quite a difference. And honestly, it doesn't stop us putting proposals in, but it means that the panelist that is we propose might not well be the panelists that eventually take part.

Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, and there were some comments from Marianne in the Chat on the same issue and essentially emphasizing that it would be good to know sooner rather than later whether the workshop will be extended. And also whether it's possible to give panelists to be confirmed for the very same reasons that Nigel mentioned.

I don't know whether you have anything to add to that, but I suppose you have said what you have to say, Eleonora, on these issues. I would encourage you to take them back to the powers that be and say there is some considerable nervousness about this issue in the community at large.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Thank you, Markus. It's Eleonora. I couldn't have said it better myself. I mean, definitely the concerns and the comments that we are hearing and reading in this meeting will be brought back for input into our discussion on this issue, and as Israel and I hinted a moment ago, I mean, this request is also already out there, so adding your voices to it does strengthen it, though, so thank you, Marianne and others.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Would you have anything else to add on this agenda item, where we are in preparation, you and Israel, of the IGF, apart from the workshops, the overall sessions, and so on.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: So just to give a quick, you know, overview of where we are in putting together the program, as you all know, the call for workshops is out right now until officially Sunday, the 27th. Tentatively, the Secretariat plans to release calls for other sessions following the close of the call for workshops and to leave that open for approximately one month. And by other sessions, I mean open forums, Day 0 session requests, as well as your individual DC session requests, and we will come to that in the next agenda item. And the idea being to have, before the MAG's face-to-face meeting on July 11, a

kind of just preliminary picture of what the components of the program are going to be. Or to at least have all the session requests gathered before that time. So these are the kind of next developments people watching the program being put together can expect. I will say those working on workshop proposals and those who have read the material put out about the process this year know there is a slightly different approach to the "program shaping," based largely on the stock-taking input we received at the end of 2017 and the beginning of 2018, the MAG decided -- and that input was largely that the program should be more cohesive, more focused, and following the MAG's discussions, it was decided that a more "thematic" approach would be taken. And that is reflected in the workshop proposal forms, for instance, with a kind of theme selection. So each proposer is asked to select from a number of themes and subthemes. And so that is the one concrete way you see this thematic approach being taken, although it's -- for the most part, the process has not changed dramatically.

But I will also let Israel comment on this because I don't know if he's bothered by my use of this term, but he was one of the people who kind of was the brains behind that program-shaping approach. So maybe, Israel, you have something to say.

>> ISRAEL ROSAS: Yes, thank you. This is Israel speaking.

Well, the call for issues, as you know, were one of the first steps in this new approach. Currently the MAG is working on the next steps through a Working Group on Workshop Evaluations. So the Working Group is open to the community, is facilitated by Dr. Rasha Abdulla. And of course, the current scenario will take into account the call for issues and the need for a more cohesive approach and a more thematic approach. But the next steps will be decided by the Working Group in a proposal to the entire MAG. So we will inform you as soon as the MAG decides on this. But of course, the idea is to have a more cohesive and more thematic meeting this year.

Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Are there questions, any questions on this? My comment would be essentially everything is open as far as I understand it as regards the main session, so I think we can not take anything for granted. It will be the MAG in their wisdom who will come up with the final template for the program. But there may be questions from the floor Israel or Eleonora might be able to answer.

If not, can we move on? Is there anything else under agenda item 1? No hands. Eleonora, maybe a brief briefing on the CSTD as they review the IGF components every year.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Yes, thanks for reminding me,

Markus. It's Eleonora by the way. Nigel actually hinted some moments ago about our running into each other at the CSTD. So CSTD stands for the Commission on Science and Technology for Development, and each year it does a review of the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information Society, on WSIS, including a section on Internet governance and on the IGF. And within that section, I am pleased to say and inform for those DCs who may not have been aware of this, but for at least the last two or three years there has been specific mention of the work of Dynamic Coalitions and the value they bring to the IGF. In a paragraph on DCs and best practice forums and other inter-sessional work. If you bear with me for a moment, I will actually share with you that exact paragraph here in the meeting room so that you can take a look at it.

But I think this is worth mentioning for coalitions to understand that there is an official recognition -- that there is an official UN recognition of their work. So for those of you who didn't know -- yes, the Secretariat is pleased to report that to you, that that language is in this document that is a draft resolution that will go to the UN's Economic and Social Council.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. That is definitely positive news, positive development, and ultimately it will go to the General Assembly, so that's the highest body of the UN, where it will be approved, the overall packet.

Yes?

>> NIGEL HICKSON: Sorry, Nigel here. Just briefly on this, because I think it's quite interesting in the overall dynamics of this.

So there was some very good text on the IGF in the draft resolution, and Elena might know who actually proposed some of it, but we had a paragraph on funding of the IGF, really reflecting some of the outcomes of the Geneva IGF, and noting how important it was that, you know, the IGF continue to be supported, including financially, into the trust fund. And this paragraph would have hopefully been agreed to. But unfortunately was deleted due to the politics of what happens at the CSTD because when this paragraph was discussed, a number of countries said well, if we are going to have a paragraph on the IGF, which is legitimate, of course, because the IGF is mentioned in the Tunis Agenda -- which is what the WSIS process is all about -- if we are going to have a paragraph on the IGF, we also have to have a paragraph on the WSIS Forum, which is the event hosted by the ITU and organized by the other UN agencies, saying that that also needs to be supported financially. This is the usual tit for tat sort of thing. The way that was

phrased wasn't acceptable to many countries. So both paragraphs were dropped, which is unfortunate, but at least we have this. We would have also had two sentences sort of welcoming the 2018 IGF. There was a placeholder saying we welcome the 2018 IGF in wherever, but obviously, that couldn't be agreed because we didn't have a location to welcome it in, so to speak.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. And just on a purely technical matter, when anything is up on the screen from Secretariat, as now, it covers the captioning. The Secretariat in the Chat gave the link where you can continue looking at the captioning. The captioning is going on in the background. If you go on that link, StreamText, you can read the captioning while the page is up. But thanks, Eleonora, for sharing the language with us. I think we can take it down again and then have the captioning again on the main screen.

With that -- and thanks, also, Nigel, for this update. Nothing new on this there. It's very much tit for tat, has always been the case in the CSTD.

Can we move on, then, to the next agenda item? Eleonora, can you put up the agenda again?

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Hi, Markus. Thank you for the delay. There it is.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No worries. Can you go to the next agenda item, and can you go ahead with it?

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Sure. So as you will see here, this is on the template that the Secretariat shared with DCs immediately after our last virtual meeting. And --

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Sorry to interrupt. Can you switch the screen again? Because -- so that we can see the captioning?

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Okay. So actually, what I will do now is display the document that's relevant to this agenda item, if that's okay, and maybe temporarily the participants can follow via the link if that's all right.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Sorry. This just takes a little bit of technical maneuvering. Please bear with me.

Okay. So I hope that you can all see on the screen the document that we are talking about. So this is a template for the submission form that DCs will use to hand in to the Secretariat their request for an individual session at the 2018 IGF. And just to remind everyone, the idea for this came about at the end of the 2017 IGF, when several DCs commented that there needed to be a more sort of streamlined way for them to first of all submit their requests, but also to display the information on their sessions, kind of in the same way that it's done for workshops. So when workshop proposers make their

proposal, they have, as you know, a set form and then the information in that form is what's used to display in the schedule for participants what their workshop is all about.

So the Secretariat got started on this with a template or draft for a form that would be sort of similar for DCs, but of course, also highly simplified compared to what workshop proposers fill in. And it's here in a Google document and was open for DCs to comment on and edit up until our meeting today, so it's been open for the last couple of weeks. You may notice that there have not really been any comments, although the Secretariat did receive an email from one DC that said that they had reviewed it, the Dynamic Coalition on Public Access and Libraries, and that they were satisfied with the content. So as Markus likes to say, sometimes no comments can be -- or no objections can be an endorsement, but we really do want to make sure that this is meeting DCs' expectations, as this form really did come about in response to a demand from DCs to have something like this.

So I don't know if it's necessarily worth going through the elements of the form, but for those who are familiar with workshop proposal forms, there is some similarity, but again, this is highly simplified, and it only contains some really just basic questions about what a DC's session would look like and would be about and takes just a few elements from a workshop proposal form, namely a question on the possible format using the same options that workshop proposers have in II. And also a couple of questions on who the co-organizers are, as we assume in general that there isn't usually one person organizing a session. It tends to be a small team. And if you could list those people, that would be good to get a sense of who the persons responsible are. And as well as a provisional list of speakers and provisionally any of the roles these sort of protagonists in the workshop might take, an online moderator and rapporteur. And also, again, taking from the workshop proposal form this year, an applicable theme and subtheme with the same selection of themes that are in the workshop forms.

And then at the bottom, the elements that are real requirements; in other words, the link to either an activities report or a substantive paper produced by the DC in the last cycle and a link to the report of that DC's session from the previous IGF, which is not just a requirement for DCs but a requirement for everyone. If you hold a session at the IGF, you have to submit a report or you may not be considered for another session the next year.

And so that about covers it. I don't know if there are any comments on this.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thanks a lot, Eleonora. I think that was a very concise presentation of the form. And also to make it clear, it's different from the workshop forms in so far as there will not be a quality judgment by the MAG, but the forms help to inform the final program and give an input into the final program.

I see Luca. Hi. Glad you could join us. You have a question? Please go ahead.

>> LUCA BELLI: Yes, good morning, everyone. Sorry if I was a little bit delayed. I was stuck in another meeting.

I had just a comment -- or a question and a comment. I just wanted to know what would be the deadline, if there is a deadline, for this form. Just reminding that as the session of DCs is supposed to showcase and be an occasion for inputs on the work we do during the year, we need a little bit more time to know who are the contributors to the work we are doing so that we include in the list of speakers those who actually contribute in the work we do, and we need a little bit of time to start beefing up the work in order to know who are the people that will contribute to the session. So just to make sure we are clear on deadlines if there is any.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thanks for the question. I think we touched on that before. And I think also the Secretariat can give some flexibility in this regard, as it's understood you have a work in progress, which is slightly different from the workshops.

Marianne asked the same question in regards the deadline, and Avri also asks about new DCs, how do you fill in the question or the heading VII and VIII.

Eleonora, do you have answers to all these questions?

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Hi, Markus. Yes, sure, I will try my best.

So just to add to what you said about giving a little bit of flexibility, definitely from the Secretariat side we can confirm that we will do that, and we understand the time needed to gather this information. And I'd also say that this form for DCs is really meant to be an improvement on last year and on previous years. So we are not going from the system we had in place last year to expectations that -- and standards that we hold workshop proposers to by any means. This is really just an effort to give a little bit of structure to the session requests.

And again, any speakers or co-organizers listed, we understand them to be provisional, and if they change, DCs will have the freedom and the flexibility to change them further down the line.

And in response to the question about timing, as Markus said, we did touch on this a little bit in the beginning of the meeting. We plan to launch the call for the session requests on 28 May roughly, and to keep this call open for approximately one month. It could be a little bit longer. The important thing is to have all requests in for the MAG's face-to-face meeting on the 11th of July. So if you have to have in your minds a date, you can at least safely assume that before 11 July is what the Secretariat is aiming for.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Avri's question, Eleonora, for new DCs.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Yes, for new DCs, clearly VIII, the session report from the previous year, is not a requirement and not applicable. For the link to an activities report or substantive paper, to be consistent with -- because actually in the last couple of years there have been quite a number of new DCs. And rather than just give them a slot in the annual meeting the moment they've been established, the Secretariat has asked for a very light activity report, just one page -- it could even be, you know, less than one page -- description of what the DC has done since it established itself just so we have a sense that a little bit of activity has taken place. I mean, of course, if you know, a DC is approved a week before the annual meeting takes place, I mean, then that's maybe a different kind of discussion, but if it's been around for maybe four or five months before the annual meeting, we would like to see just a broad and light description of what the DC is doing.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that.

Just a quick reaction to Luca's note in the Chat. The deadline is not the 11th of July as such, but it should be certainly before the 11th of July so that it can be prepared for the MAG to review, and the MAG meeting is on the 11th of July. So it's safer to say end of June or beginning of July, first days of July, just to make sure that you don't wait, then, for too long and think you are safe. End of June should be safer, yes.

Now, essentially, can we come to closure with this session request form, or -- Olivier, you have a question? Please.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Markus. Olivier Crepin Leblond speaking. Actually, I thought we were on the DCs briefing document.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Not yet.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Because Eleonora just mentioned it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: No. The session request form essentially was up for comment for the DCs, but there was very little feedback, and at one point we need to come to closure and say

this is the form. Now, can we do that now or can we give a couple of days or so that the Secretariat can then go ahead on that this coming Monday, the 28th, as they want to. As they had planned. I am open to that, but as not every DC is on the call, it might not be a bad idea to give just a couple more days to review final adjustments. Or are we comfortable with the document and say that is the document and ask the Secretariat to go ahead?

>> NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah, there's been plenty of time to review it; hasn't there? It seems pretty good.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: There has been, indeed. Okay. Shall we then assume that we close the document and take it as the final version for the DCs then to submit their requests? I think I see a lot of approval in the Chat, and I hear nobody speaking out against, so we have a template for the request form. Thanks. That's great.

Now we come to the briefing document, and I wonder whether Avri, who was sort of the main driving force between last year's briefing document, would like to give the brief introduction. Sorry to put you on the spot. It's not mandatory, but if you feel like it, you can -- yeah.

>> AVRIA DORIA: This is Avri. I really don't know what to say. I hadn't thought of the briefing document in quite a while. So really would prefer to defer to you and Israel because at the moment nothing occurs to me to say.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Fair enough. Okay. It was a great document. I think it responded to some questions the MAG had, what are the DCs, what role do they play, it and provides some useful background information. But I would like maybe Eleonora again to introduce the document, as she has given some thought to it. And the idea would be to have a slight, light update. I mean, there is obviously the years and so on that need to be changed, but Eleonora, please.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Thank you, Markus. So as you said, the briefing document was something that DCs and Avri and the Secretariat drafted together last year. Actually, there was just like a very basic draft that the Secretariat started, and then DCs and Avri was developed, which was done originally for an oral briefing to the MAG as a basis of an oral briefing to the MAG about what DCs are, how they work, and what some of their specific activities and outcomes are. Because there seemed to be maybe a little bit of mystery surrounding what all the stuff that DCs do is. And especially for new MAG members, this was seen as very helpful and very clarifying. And although there has not been a lot of discussion about DCs in the MAG yet, I think we can expect at some point that, you know, DCs will be

discussed, and maybe that information will have to be refreshed a little bit because, again, we have many new MAG members this year. In fact, a record number of new members who may not fully know what DCs are and how they work. And if we were to hypothetically present a document to them again, it should be updated to reflect any developments in the past year.

So you will see on your screens in the meeting room the document in a Google Doc basically as it was in 2017. I have gone ahead and just updated the years a little bit and basic facts like the number of DCs that we have, and just straightforward, factual information. And I highlighted in yellow the specific paragraphs where DCs could really go in and expand a little bit on their own activities or cite an example of a good outcome document -- for instance, in this paragraph you have here on the screen -- and really point to specific examples that pertain to their work.

So this is a proposal that we are putting out to coalitions, whether they feel it would be a worthwhile exercise to update this document that would be informative for the MAG. Last year's document was published on the IGF website, so it could also be informative to the general public. What it attempts to do also in a general, broad way is really highlight all the work that DCs are doing. And I think, you know, people have some ideas of what one particular coalition is doing and what it's all about, but they don't necessarily get a big picture in one place, and this document tries to some extent to do that.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thanks, Eleonora. And Avri in the Chat already said the challenge will come up again, and it would be useful to have an updated document.

In a way, I would take it for granted that there is a market for that, for having the document updated. But the question I would put to the group is whether we want to just have a soft update, just update the basics, Eleonora has already started, or whether it might not be useful, there might not be merit in expanding it a little bit and give substantive overview of what individual DCs are actually doing. That could be in the form of an annex where each DC gives a kind of executive summary that can be a one-pager of their activities and achievements. So there will be one document that will give really an overall overview of DCs, not just from a structural and procedural point of view, but also from a substantive point of view. That's the question I would like to put to the group. But again, that does not need to be on a mandatory basis. If you have such an annex, the DCs who feel it's useful can contribute, and I think we have all the stuff you have seen already in the past. I don't think

it would be a major job on your part. But I, for one, think it would be useful to have a sort of overall view of all the DCs.

And as Olivier had his hand up, as he thought we were already on this agenda item, I wonder whether he would like to jump in now.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Markus. Olivia Crepin-Leblond speaking.

I was going to ask regarding the points Eleonora had made earlier on the briefing documents whether -- what were the differences between this year and last year? I think that was at the time I wanted to ask a question, but until now we somehow covered it.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you.

Luca?

>> LUCA BELLI: Thank you, Markus. I wanted to second your idea, your proposal of an annex, including the work that we have been doing over the past years because I think the best way to prove to anyone that we are doing meaningful work is to actually show what are the documents, the reports, and the recommendations, the tools, everything we have been developing over the past 12 years.

A couple of months ago, Eleonora requested to update the section of the Dynamic Coalition pages on documents and reports. I think it would be -- I mean, it's simply -- what we can simply do is just to copy and paste what already is there. If we use that section of our pages, the IGF website of the work we do, we have a simple and easy way to not only prove those of us who are able to reach that page from the very beginning what we do, but to copy and paste, have a Dynamic Coalition summary with an annex directly reporting all the progress that we, I think, should have on that page. At least for the coalition in which I am involved, it was kind of frustrating not to have that kind of reference, and I think it's very useful now to have a page where all the work we are doing are included. It's proof that we have some value.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for your comment. I see also Nigel in the Chat: Happy to go along with the annex and having a contribution for each DC.

Well, I think we can just put it up as a Google Doc and ask you all to, that is to the main process, to join the collaborative process and add substantive summaries of your activity in an annex.

Yeah, and Avri, in the Chat, yes, there should be short descriptions. And I was also thinking of one or two page, two page max, I think. Ideally an executive summary on the one page. I do remember when I worked for government, you had to

write a note for the minister when he met other ministers. These were two pages. Then on the two-pager, you had to have a half page of executive summaries, essentially bearing in mind that people have limited attention spans. The shorter, the snappier, the better. So one page would be ideal.

But Luca, please.

>> LUCA BELLI: Maybe I was not really speaking my mind clearly. My suggestion was not to copy and paste the entire documents, obviously, otherwise it would take hundreds of pages. I was just suggesting to copy and paste that section of each Dynamic Coalition webpage, where there are reports and documents, and it is like bullet points where there is maybe only the title of the specific report or the specific proposal for declaration or recommendations, so it's in the total for each Dynamic Coalition is not even a page for the Dynamic Coalition because it's only one line per outcome. Well, the majority of Dynamic Coalition may have at most 12 outcomes. So it's at most 12 lines or 24 at most if you also include the annual, the session reports. So it will not be more than one page or one page and a half per coalition.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yeah, I think they are all on the same page. I think Avri also in the Chat says the same. But my take would be it's all great to ask all the points, but it should also maybe, again, you know, a few sentences of flow text where they actually explain what it means and why it's important, then have all the references in the bullet points come after. But you do need a kind of header that draws you into the work. But obviously, we leave that up to each Dynamic Coalition how best to present themselves.

Avri says: It seems there are people who cannot read bullet points, their eyes just skip over them.

There is that. Links is all fine to meeting reports, but I think you do need to have for -- let's assume a minister is interested in all that and will ask what does Dynamic Coalition on Rights and Principles do? And that used to be the saying can you explain it when you talk to the CEO, you meet him in the elevator, can you explain it what you are doing? And that should be some sort of in a box, in a few simple sentences saying what you are doing and why it's important. But again, it's up to you to find the ideal format, but just to think that just URLs and bullet points may not necessarily be what draws the reader in, into the work.

That's my comment on this. But I take it the general idea found positive response, so my suggestion will be let's go ahead with it, and up to you to find the ideal format, and we can also continue the discussion as it will be in a Google format, and we

can also learn from each other, look at what the other guys are doing, and maybe the way they are doing it can also be useful for your presentation.

Can we conclude with that? Are there further comments, suggestions? If not, I would assume, then, that we can go forward with that, and Eleonora will post it as a Google Doc.

And can we move to any other business with that? I think, Eleonora, you had also a few points, and there may be some Dynamic Coalitions who have a few points. We have a few minutes left. Eleonora.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Hi, Markus. Hi, everyone. I just wanted to quickly say thank you to DCs for embracing the long-awaited calendar. We already have several DC meetings on there, and some have already taken place, a number have already taken place. And I am just going to share the calendar in the Chat, and I wanted to take the opportunity to highlight it because I think it's a really good -- again, picking up on what we were talking about with this briefing document -- a very good way of visualizing how much DCs are doing. I mean, if you look at this month alone, you see how much DCs are meeting and how much activity is taking place there, and that's another useful, although simple, communication tool to give people an idea of what's going on in the DCs community.

And again, if anyone wants to have their meeting featured there, please get us in touch with the Secretariat, and we are more than happy to put in those details and share them with everyone publicly.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thanks, Eleonora. It's a great improvement and I think enhances the transparency, and it's a good working tool.

Are there questions or comments on that, or are there other items under any other business?

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: I am sorry, Nigel has his hand up.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Nigel, please.

>> NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much. Just very briefly. I've got to dash off for another call. But just really to pass on some comments from Martin, you know, who heads up our DC on the Internet of Things. And he just wanted to confirm, though I think this might have been done before, that we'll certainly put in for a session for the DC, and also we would be happy to contribute to any overall session on IoT or related issue. But I guess that's something we can explore as we go along. I think there is a related Best Practice Forum that we've certainly reached out to, but if there was going to be a main session on the Internet of Things, then we would be happy to contribute. Yeah, just wanted to note that. I better

go. Thank you very much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thanks for that. Okay. Bye-bye, Nigel.

>> NIGEL HICKSON: Cheers.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Take care.

Are there other issues under any other business anyone would like to pick up?

If not, then can I take it that we reached the end of our agenda and of our meeting. It's top of the hour, so that's very efficient. Nothing else from me.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: I am sorry, Markus. I see that Luca has his hand up. I am not sure if it's an old hand.

>> LUCA BELLI: I just forgot to put it down.

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Okay.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. But for me, it's just thank you and good-bye. Israel and Eleonora, would you like to add anything? I would also like to thank our scribes for the captioning. I think that's a great improvement to our meetings.

So I have nothing else to add. From me, it's good-bye and thank you. Israel or Eleonora?

>> ELEONORA MAZZUCCHI: Thank you, Markus. Nothing to add except that as we agreed here, I will be sharing -- the Secretariat will be sharing on the mailing list shortly this document for everyone to update and add to.

And with that, see you next time.

>> ISRAEL ROSAS: I have nothing to add. Thank you for joining us, and we'll keep you updated with IGF and all the MAG-related issues. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you all. Good-bye.

(End of session, 10:01 a.m. CT.)

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.
